DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 415 FL 025 261

AUTHOR	Yamauchi, Lois A.; Ceppi, Andrea K.; Lau-Smith, Jo-Anne
TITLE	A Sociohistorical Analysis of the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on the Education of At-Risk Students (ED/OERI), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
CONTRACT	R306A60001
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hawaiian; *Heritage Education; *Immersion Programs; Indigenous Populations; *Language Maintenance; Language of Instruction; Official Languages; Program Descriptions; Public Schools; Second Language Learning; Second Language Programs; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Hawaii

ABSTRACT

Papahana Kaiapuni is a K-12 indigenous language immersion program in selected public schools in the State of Hawai'i. Instruction in Kaiapuni classrooms is conducted in the Hawaiian language. Program goals include students' development of a high level of proficiency in both Hawaiian and English. For nearly a century, policy banning the Hawaiian language from the public schools and other government activities contributed to the decline of the language's use. Papahana Kaiapuni is an effort to revive the Hawaiian language, now the second official language of the state. Supporters of the program believe that the program may also serve to promote both the cultural identity and the academic achievement of the Native Hawaiians. Social and historical influences on the program's development are outlined, drawing from literature about the program, interviews with individuals involved in early program development, and an analysis of selected board of education and federal documents. Interview questions are appended. (Contains 49 references.) (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 415

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Sociohistorical Analysis of the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program

Lois Yamauchi

Lois A. Yamauchi
Andrea K. Ceppi
Jo-Anne Lau-Smith
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Paper presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 17, 1998, San Diego, CA.

Author Note. The work herein was supported under the Education Research and Development Program, PR/Award No. R306A60001, as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U. S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Lois A. Yamauchi, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Hawai'i, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu, HI 96822. Phone: (808)956-4294. Email may be sent via Internet to yamauchi@hawaii.edu.

FL025261

Abstract

Papahana Kaiapuni is a K-12 indigenous language immersion program in selected public schools in the State of Hawai'i. Instruction in Kaiapuni classrooms is conducted in the Hawaiian language. Program goals include students' development of a high level of proficiency in both the Hawaiian and English languages (Department of Education, 1994). For nearly a century, policy banning the Hawaiian language from the public schools and other government activities contributed to the decline of the language's use. Papahana Kaiapuni is an effort to revive the Hawaiian language, now the second official language of the State. Supporters of the program believe that the program may also serve to promote both the cultural identity and the academic achievement of the Native Hawaiians it serves. In this paper we describe the sociohistorical influences on the development of the Kaiapuni program, drawing from a literature review of articles written about the program, interviews with individuals involved in early program development, and an analysis of selected Board of Education and Department of Education documents.

A Sociohistorical Analysis of the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program

Introduction

Papahana Kaiapuni, also called Kaiapuni, is a K-12 Hawaiian language immersion program in selected public schools in the State of Hawai'i. Kaiapuni classrooms adhere to the same State Department of Education (DOE) standards[1] as do other programs in the DOE. However, instruction in Kaiapuni classrooms is conducted through the medium of the Hawaiian language. Kaiapuni developed within a context of renewed interest in the Hawaiian culture and language. It evolved through the efforts of Hawaiian language activists and other community members interested in reviving the indigenous language.

There are many indicators that Hawai'i schools are not adequately addressing the needs of Hawaiian students. Native Hawaiians are among the lowest scoring minorities in the nation on standardized achievement tests. They are also over-represented in special education and under-represented in higher education (Melahn, 1986; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 1994; Takenaka, 1995).Many Kaiapuni supporters feel that Hawaiian immersion is a method that can serve to increase the achievement and boost the identity and self-esteem of the Hawaiian children it serves.[2]

Kaiapuni began in 1987 with two K-1 combination classes. Ten years later, over 1,300 students and 85 teachers now participate in the program at 15 sites on five of the seven major Hawaiian Islands. In this paper we explore the sociohistorical influences leading to the initiation and development of the

---

[1] Hawai'i is the only state in the nation where education is overseen and funded at the state level, rather than at more local district levels. The elected Board of Education appoints the State Superintendent, who then oversees operation of the DOE.

[2] Although children of all ethnic groups in the State may enroll in the program, the majority of students in the program are of Hawaiian or Part-Hawaiian ancestry.

Kaiapuni program. These circumstances offer unique insight into the social and political climate of the State of Hawai'i and its culturally diverse mix of people.

Method

Data for this study were gathered through (a) semi-structured interviews with people involved in the early program development; (b) a review of research, newspaper, and newsletter articles written about the program over the last ten years; and (c) an analysis of selected DOE and Board of Education (BOE) documents.

Interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 people who were involved in the early development of the program. (See Appendix A for the interview questions.) Interviewees included (a) four immersion teachers, including the first two teachers in the program; (b) three of the first principals; (c) a DOE administrator involved in early program development; (d) a BOE member considered instrumental in getting the program established in the DOE, and (e) a parent whose child was in one of first Kaiapuni classes. Each of these interviewees was nominated by the DOE educational specialist who currently coordinates the program. Participation was voluntary. In appreciation for participants' involvement, the researchers donated $40 worth of books or supplies to a Kaiapuni school of the interviewee's choice.

Interviews were approximately one hour in length and conducted by a member of the research team. In some cases, two members were present, in which case one researcher took the role of lead interviewer. Interviews were audiotape recorded and later transcribed for analysis. In one case, the audiotape recorder did not work and therefore, analysis was conducted on the interviewer's fieldnotes of the participant's responses (Yamauchi, 1997a).

The QSR NUD*IST qualitative data analysis program was used to assist in data analysis. Coding categories were established through examination of field

notes, re-reading of the transcripts, and discussions by the researchers. After establishing the coding scheme, the three researchers coded two of the same transcripts independently, and met to establish consensus on category criteria. Once consensus was met, the researchers divided the remaining transcripts and coded these independently. The coders met weekly during this process to discuss problems or questions that arose about the coding process and to further refine the coding scheme.

Document analysis. Two hundred and seven documents were acquired from the BOE member who was interviewed for the study. This individual had been keeping a personal archive of BOE and DOE documents pertaining to the Kaiapuni program development between the years 1987 and 1995. One of the researchers analyzed the documents by reading through each and noting passages that were relevant to the themes that had emerged in the interview analysis.

What is a Language Immersion Program?

There are several different types of language programs being implemented in today's schools (see Yamauchi & Ceppi, in press for a full description). Within this range, Kaiapuni is considered a total language immersion program. Total immersion uses a non-majority language, in this case the native language Hawaiian, almost exclusively in the initial years of schooling. The majority language (English) is then introduced gradually at various points in the course of study (Met, 1987). The purpose of most native language immersion programs is to assist in the revitalization and maintenance of an endangered indigenous language. In addition, total immersion has been implemented to better educate children who have been potentially placed at-risk because of cultural and linguistic incompatibilities between the school system and home or community environments (Yamauchi & Ceppi, in press).

A Brief History of Policy Influencing the Hawaiian Language

Following the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, the U. S. government promoted a formal policy that replaced the Hawaiian language with English for all formal governmental activities including public education. Prior to this, Hawaiian was the language of business, government, media, and education (Wilson, in press). Hawaiian was also the language of inter-ethnic communication, as most children of immigrants spoke Hawaiian in addition to their first language. The efforts of the Christian missionaries who came to the islands in the early 1820's to convert the populace and to promote literacy resulted in at least half of the adult population reading and writing in Hawaiian by 1830 (Slaughter, 1997). In 1850, the entire population of Hawaiian adults was considered literate in their native language (Kloss, 1977).

Originally, Hawaiian was the language of formal education in the islands, used first by Hawaiians themselves and later by American Protestant missionaries after their arrival in 1820 (Kuykendall, 1926). However, with increasing pressure from Americans for English language instruction, the language of the public schools gradually shifted to English. In 1896, the Hawaiian language was banned in the public schools and English became official medium of instruction. Such policies to exclude the Hawaiian language quickly resulted in fewer speakers and opportunities to converse in the language.

Contemporary *kūpuna* (Hawaiian elders) recall being punished, sometimes physically, for speaking their first language in school (Viotti, 1996). During the century in which Hawaiian was banned from the schools, children were taught that the Hawaiian language and culture were wrong and lesser than the English language and American culture. The policies to exclude Hawaiian culture and language from the formal lives of its people have had dramatic results in the socioeconomic and academic lives of Native Hawaiians (Ah Nee-

Benham & Heck, 1997). As a group, Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians are frequently found at the lowest levels of school achievement and other socioeconomic indices (Dunford, 1991; Takenaka, 1995).

The Hawaiian Renaissance

The 1970's marked the beginning of a "Hawaiian renaissance," or renewal in pride and interest in the Hawaiian culture and language, including renewed interest in Hawaiian music, dance, and navigation, and language (Ah Nee-Benham, & Heck, 1997; Wilson, in press). Native Hawaiian political activism increased, especially regarding issues related to restoration of Hawaiian lands taken during colonization and the re-establishment of Hawaiian sovereignty (Ah Nee-Benham & Heck, 1997). Enrollment in Hawaiian language courses increased at the University of Hawai'i and at Kamehameha Schools, a private school for children of Hawaiian ancestry (Wilson, in press). Perhaps the most prominent result of the Hawaiian renaissance regarding language issues was the institution of Hawaiian, in 1978, to accompany English as one of the two official languages of the State. In 1986, after intense lobbying by parents who had enrolled their children in a private Hawaiian medium preschool (Kamanā & Wilson, 1996) and other Hawaiian activists, legislation banning the Hawaiian language from the public schools was finally rescinded nearly a century after its enactment.

At the time the Hawaiian renaissance was beginning to develop into a civil rights movement, the Hawaiian language was in extreme jeopardy. An entire generation of people had grown up with little or no exposure to the language. The health and the future of any language can be gauged by the number of young speakers and by looking at the transmission of the language from the older generation to the younger ones (Krauss, 1996; Reedy, 1982). In 1984, there were only 30 children under the age of 18 who spoke Hawaiian (Dunford, 1991), and the numbers of native speaking kūpuna were decreasing steadily. The

frightening prospect of losing the Hawaiian language forever spurred the movement to establish Hawaiian medium schools. One Kaiapuni principal noted that there was a "growing awareness among the Hawaiian community that they...had become strangers in their own land, that when a language dies, a culture dies...so I know that's where [the program] comes from...a renaissance of Hawaiian culture" (Yamauchi, 1997b, paragraph 132). As one of the first Kaiapuni teachers said, the program is "riding the wave" of Hawaiian things being of interest to many people today. (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 256).

Why Hawaiian Immersion?

> The ultimate goal is to make Hawai'i a place where Hawaiian is spoken again...[and] part of the goal is that it's not going to die with this generation of native speakers...cause there's not a lot of them left (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 507).

This statement, made by a Kaiapuni teacher, reflects the program's goal to revitalize the Hawaiian language. This teacher described the slow process of rebuilding a community of language speakers and recognized that such an accomplishment might not occur within her lifetime. Other interviewees also cited saving the Hawaiian language as a primary reason for getting involved in the program. Another teacher stated that, "it was always my interest...to perpetuate the language" (Yamauchi, 1997e, paragraph 92). One parent said, "I wanted to make sure that Hawaiian language survived forever...it was very important that our ancestral language never die" (Yamauchi, 1997c, paragraph 122).

Some people's resolve is further strengthened by a belief that the survival of the language is intimately related to the maintenance of the culture in which it is embedded:

> People say the language is the culture, but to me, the language is like the perspective of the people...like, there's no word for hate in Hawaiian...doesn't that say something about the Hawaiian psyche...if there's no learning of that, then that whole psyche kind of disappears (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 513).

Another interviewee noted, "It goes farther...deeper than the cuteness of the languages that it's a whole lifestyle of a race...the language" (Yamauchi, 1997f, paragraph 177). These sentiments reflect the notion that the loss of a language involves more than the loss of a set of words. There are ideas, beliefs, customs, and, indeed, and entire system of thought and perception embodied in those words (St. Clair, 1982; Vygotsky & Luria, 1994; Reyhner, 1996a; Reyhner & Tennant, 1995; Hammond & Onikama, 1996) which are potentially lost when a language ceases to exist.

Pūnana Leo: The Beginning of the Hawaiian Medium Movement

'Aha Pūnana Leo, Inc. is the parent organization of the private Pūnana Leo Hawaiian language immersion preschools, which became the root of the Kaiapuni program. Pūnana Leo preschools opened in 1984 and were based on the Te Kohonga Reo immersion preschools in New Zealand. (Kame'eleihiwa, 1992; Wilson, in press). Similar to the situation in Hawai'i, the Maori language was threatened with language extinction. The Maori people implemented Te Kohonga Reo in a successful bid to resurrect their dying language (Reedy, 1982). Many of the issues the Maori faced concerning indigenous rights were also similar to those faced by the Native Hawaiians. Pūnana Leo founders met with Te Kohonga Reo leaders, who urged them to consider indigenous immersion education as a means of revitalizing their language (Bowman, 1990; Yamauchi, 1997d). A parent who was involved in lobbying for the implementation of Kaiapuni commented that the people involved in developing Pūnana Leo,

"frequently [went] down to Aotearoa, to look at how they're language programs [were] working." (Yamauchi, 1997c, paragraph 126). Because of the similarity between the Maori and Hawaiian situations, these developers looked to New Zealand for guidance.

There are now nine Pūnana Leo sites statewide. Instruction in the preschool is entirely in the Hawaiian language and parents of the preschoolers are required to learn the language as well (Kamanā & Wilson, 1995). Parents are also required to spend eight hours each month working for the school and to attend a monthly organizational meeting (Kamanā & Wilson, 1996; Wilson, in press). This kind of commitment both attracts and develops parents who are advocates for their children's education and the Hawaiian language. As the first group of preschoolers moved towards school age, parents, teachers, and administrators of Pūnana Leo began to imagine possible options for their students:

> Pūnana Leo is the "driving force"...the preschool started because a bunch of college language people were sitting around wanting to do something in the language for their kids...then the natural step is, okay, now after preschool what are we gonna do...they felt that the State of Hawai'i owed it to the Hawaiian people to do this for them. (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 294).

A former Kaiapuni principal admitted that Kaiapuni "wasn't something the DOE came up with. It was extended to the DOE" (Yamauchi, 1997g, paragraph 85). All interviewees credit Pūnana Leo supporters as Kaiapuni's stimulus. "You have to give credit where credit is due, you know, they wanted to see the continuing of the Pūnana Leo into the upper grades...so I think...everything has to do with the Pūnana Leo" (Yamauchi, 1997f, paragraph

97). The root of the DOE program was the Pūnana Leo preschools, and the driving force behind it were its parents and community activists.

Establishing the Program Within the Public Schools

In 1986 the oldest children at Pūnana Leo preschools were ready to enter kindergarten. Parents and other Punana Leo supporters began to lobby the BOE to establish a Hawaiian medium program in the public schools. These activists were committed to saving the Hawaiian language and believed that immersion was the way to accomplish that goal. A DOE administrator noted, "The first year [were]...radical groups...just to the core [they did] anything possible to keep this program afloat, and the commitment was overwhelming" (Yamauchi, 1997g, paragraph 60).

At a BOE Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee meeting, Kauanoe Kamanā, president of 'Aha Pūnana Leo, Inc. and parent of a child in the preschool argued that the success of the immersion method had been documented in Canada since the 1960s (Board of Education, 1987a). Kamanā also contended that a Hawaiian language immersion program would preserve and maintain the Hawaiian language and culture for all residents of the State. Other supporters argued that the program would strengthen the ethnic identity and esteem of Hawaiian children in the program. The group proposed that an elementary program (K-6) be established in the DOE, with formal English language instruction introduced in either grades 3 or 4.

Lilikala Kame'elehiwa, a Punana Leo parent who had been involved in early lobbying for the program, said that she felt that if the BOE wouldn't support the program, it was, in a sense, a continuation of earlier oppression of the Hawaiian language and culture:

> One of the things I used to bring up at the BOE is if our language is killed by you, the DOE, which it was, children were beaten for speaking

> Hawaiian, right?...Since you guys participated in this and you want to see our language die out. You don't want to support this program, it's called genocide. If we're no longer able to speak our language, our culture fades away. We don't know anything about our culture, except what we read in our English language texts, right? We can't speak Hawaiian. We don't even know what our names mean anymore. We don't have our identity anymore. We cease to exist as people on the face of this earth and that's wrong." (Yamauchi, 1997c, paragraph 202).

Kame'elehiwa said that her role became one of putting political pressure on the BOE. She felt that it was consistent harassment of the BOE on the part of parents and other activists that finally led to the establishment of the program in the public schools.

The BOE member we interviewed, however, had a different perspective on how the program finally came to be established as a DOE program. Francis McMillen, one of the only BOE members of Hawaiian ancestry, recalled being new as a BOE member when he first heard the testimony of the Pūnana Leo parents and other language activists before the BOE's Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee (Yamauchi, 1997h). According to McMillen, the parents and other language activists who had been coming to BOE meetings were very frustrated about not having their voices heard. McMillen said that after an April 1987 meeting he pulled the group aside and asked them to explain what they wanted. It wasn't until then that he realized that they were asking for an immersion program in the schools (Yamauchi & Ceppi, in press). McMillen had felt that the group's earlier testimony was too fragmented and did not communicate what they wanted. He told the group to come back with a more cohesive presentation and that when they did he would assure that they would be heard.

One month later, the group reappeared—much earlier than McMillen thought that they would. The group presented "a more coherent case" that was favorably received by the Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee, which then appointed a sub-committee to prepare for September implementation (Board of Education, 1987b). On July 23, 1987, the BOE passed a resolution approving the program as a pilot K-1 project at four sites on the islands on O'ahu, Hawai'i, Maui, and Kaua'i (Board of Education, 1987b).[3] The project was described as a "learning center" with a magnet approach and would be housed on existing elementary school campuses. Immersion students would have their own classroom instruction conducted in Hawaiian, but would not be segregated from others at the school (Board of Education, 1987c).

Kaiapuni as a "special case." Considering the typical procedures of the BOE, there are a number of ways in which the immersion program was treated as a special case. For example, the BOE typically establishes new programs at least two years in advance, allowing lead time for planning and time to appeal to the State legislature for funding (Yamauchi, 1997h). In the case of Hawaiian Immersion, however, the BOE formally approved the pilot project less than two months before it was implemented. In addition, it is more typical that once the BOE establishes a policy approving a particular program for development in the schools, it is then handed over to the DOE for implementation. In the Kaiapuni case, however, the BOE closely monitored the program's development itself, by placing the project under the purview of its Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee.

[3] According to the DOE, the Kaua'i and Maui sites subsequently did not open due to a lack of interest (Board of Education, 1987b).

Early Implementation by the DOE

In September 1987 two schools opened their doors to the first Kaiapuni students at Waiau Elementary School on O'ahu and Keaukaha Elementary School on the island of Hawai'i. Alohalani Housman, a parent of a Kaiapuni student and one of those first Kaiapuni teachers, expressed her thoughts on the early rush to begin:

> From a parent's point of view, I don't think that the program started too early. This is because I really wanted my kids in the program. I wanted them to continue on from Pūnana Leo....From a teacher's point of view, I like to compare the program to a pearl. At first, when a grain of sand goes into an oyster, it is rough. No one would really desire to have it. After years and years of work....well, in essence we are shaping that pearl here. The pearl is the program. The longer it is around, the more refined it becomes, the greater it's value. It would have been nice to have had the luxury of starting after we had already had the resources and the teachers, but I don't think the program started too soon. (Yamauchi, 1997a, paragraph 127).

Another teacher, who also taught one of the early classes shared a different perspective of the how the program started, "I always thought from the beginning that...we started too fast...[be]cause we started with nothing...there was never any point like development...and then start. It was okay start. And so, we've since the beginning we've played catch-up..." (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 312). A review of the comments made by the interviewees suggest three main concerns shared by parents, teachers, principals and BOE members regarding the initial start up of Kaiapuni: (a) finding appropriate school sites, (b) hiring qualified teachers and (c) obtaining appropriate curriculum materials in the Hawaiian language.

Locating suitable school sites. Space is a limited commodity in the State of Hawai'i, and finding available classroom space in schools was one of the first challenges for the Kaiapuni program. A DOE administrator indicated that were many factors to consider, but a supportive administrator was crucial to where the program could be housed (Yamauchi, 1997i). The principal at Waiau felt that one reason her school was selected stemmed from her relationship with the State Assistant Superintendent, who knew she could help start the program with a minimum of disruption to the rest of her school (Yamauchi, 1997g). Decisions about the location of the sites also included consideration of what facilities were available, the DOE's standards for classroom facilities, and accessibility to the sites for interested families(Yamauchi, 1997h).

Location of the school sites was a concern for parents because no allocations were made by the DOE to provide transportation to students who would attend a Kaiapuni school outside of their community. The principal of Waiau Elementary School felt that her school was chosen because it was centrally located on the island of O'ahu. Expressing a different perspective, the parent we interviewed felt that Waiau was not a good site because it was situated too far from the University of Hawai'i to benefit from university direction of curriculum development (Yamauchi, 1997c).

Finding qualified teachers. Finding teachers who were qualified to teach in the Hawaiian language was another challenge. One principal stated:

> My early concerns were for a qualified teacher...and I didn't just want someone who spoke Hawaiian, but I want[ed] a teacher...in every sense of the word who also spoke Hawaiian...so that's always been my concern, that [the] Hawaiian Immersion program must be about a quality education in [the] Hawaiian language (Yamauchi, 1997b, paragraph 44).

In addition to finding qualified teachers for the immersion program, recruiting teachers for the other "neighbor" islands has been an even greater concern. As BOE member McMillen pointed out, most students graduating from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in Hawaiian Studies are not interested in moving from O'ahu to neighboring islands. (Yamauchi, 1997h).

Puanani Wilhelm and Alohalani Housman were the first Kaiapuni teachers at Keaukaha and Waiau Elementary Schools, respectively. Both teachers remember being recruited by their University of Hawai'i Hawaiian language teachers to become the first teachers for the program. Wilhelm said she became involved because suddenly the long list of potential teachers had dwindled to only a few who could really take the job (Yamauchi, & Ceppi, in press, Yamauchi, 1997d). Wilhelm did not feel that she was asked because she was the "best qualified" person but because she was available. She was living out of state at the time the immersion program was being approved, but moved back to Hawai'i to become a Kaiapuni teacher.

Housman sees herself as a pioneer of Kaiapuni. She wanted to be the teacher at Waiau because her daughter was going to be in the first class, having just graduated from Punana Leo. Housman found out the day before classes started the she was going to be the Kaiapuni teacher at Waiau. "I was excited. I really wanted the program to keep on going in the DOE, at the same time [I was] fearful. You don't know where you're going until you get there. It was overwhelming" (Yamauchi, 1997a. paragraph 49).

Developing the Kaiapuni curriculum. Both of the first two teachers viewed the initial year as overwhelming, especially when they discovered there was little curriculum and materials for their classrooms. Although Pūnana Leo curriculum developers provided some support, the teachers found that they created most of what they used: "The first years, I would stay up all night translating materials

that we would read in five minutes the next day. I was trying to do it all" (Yamauchi, 1997a, paragraph 49). McMillen explained that because the Hawaiian language had been suppressed for 100 years, materials did not exist in the language, except for old newspaper articles--which, as one teacher pointed out, was not the most appropriate text for early childhood education. Teachers spent hours translating text from English to Hawaiian and pasting the translations over the English words:

> I spent pretty much everyday 'til ten o'clock just doing stuff for the next day cause there wasn't anything...And cutting and pasting translations...on math worksheets...you know with a white Avery label and pen?...So the translation for...the first grade math book was my handwriting on Avery labels for a long time. Which is very bizarre (Yamauchi, 1997d, paragraph 122).

Parents and other supporters also assisted in the development of curriculum. Faculty and students from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and Hilo Departments of Hawaiian Language and Hawaiian Studies lent their resources and time. Eventually, workshops were offered to facilitate Pūnana Leo and Kaiapuni teachers' collaborating on various curriculum development projects.

Expanding the Program Through Grade 6

In 1989, the BOE Hawaiian Educational Affairs Committee organized a study group to examine the resources available to support the continuation of the Kaiapuni pilot project (Aizawa, 1989). Study group members included three BOE members, the DOE Hawaiian Studies specialist, three DOE administrators, and an elementary school principal. At the end of these deliberations, the study group made a number of recommendations to the BOE and the State Superintendent (Aizawa, 1989). Among them, the group recommended that the

status of the pilot program be changed from that of a "pilot" program to one that was considered "limited." This would establish Kaiapuni as a regular DOE program, though limited in scope and size. Limited program status would also indicate that the program could not be replicated at all schools, but could be replicated in each district. The study group further recommended that the program expand to the next grade levels with English instruction introduced in grade 3 to prepare for standardized testing in English. The study group suggested that instruction during the fourth grade transition to a bilingual Hawaiian-English model with half of the instruction each day devoted to each language (Aiona, 1989, Aizawa, 1989). On June 15, 1989, the BOE approved the establishment of a "limited" K-6 Hawaiian language immersion program with transition to English during grades 4-6 (Aiona, 1990).

The BOE/DOE position that the program begin to transition to a bilingual model in grade 4 was challenged by parents and language activists who preferred that the program continue as a total immersion program. Eventually, the BOE accepted the position of the parents and approved a plan for continued total immersion with the introduction of English instruction in the fourth grade. By this time, however, the parent group felt that English language instruction should be delayed until grade 5. The parent group lobbied the BOE by presenting studies of other immersion programs that indicated the benefits of delayed exposure.

In August 1990, Sam No'eau Warner, a Hawaiian language instructor from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa submitted a report to the BOE Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee on behalf of the recently created Hawaiian Immersion Advisory Council. The report summarized the research that supported the group's recommendation to delay English language instruction until grade 5. The report also recommended limiting English

instruction to between 45 and 60 minutes each day and to a room separate from where Hawaiian would be taught (Warner, 1990). Warner's report also cited evidence from the evaluation of the first three years of the Kaiapuni project, indicating that Kaiapuni students were developing proficient English literacy skills without formal instruction in that language. The DOE responded that although they agreed with the findings of Warner's report, they ultimately recommended against the delay of English instruction to the fifth grade because their (the DOE's) goals were necessarily broader than those stated in Warner's proposal:

> Mr. Warner states that the "overall goal stated explicitly by parents has been the perpetuation of the indigenous language of Hawai'i." (p. 4). Recognizing the Department's responsibility to assist every child to achieve all the Foundation Program objectives, the Department's objectives are necessarily much broader....The Department of Education's overall goal might be stated as developing a truly bilingual child by the end of Grade 6 (Aizawa, 1990, p. 1).

DOE officials indicated that they were not willing to risk students' future academic success by delaying English instruction and by relying on the results of studies conducted elsewhere, "The demonstrated difficulty of our immigrant children to acquire the reading and writing skills in English, long after oral proficiency in English has been acquired, leaves us cautious about delaying the introduction of English skills too long" (Aizawa, 1990, p. 2). Assistant Superintendent Aizawa outlined the DOE's plans to introduce English in Kaiapuni classrooms for 60 minutes each day of the first semester of the fourth grade and two hours in the second semester. English instruction in grade 5 would continue for two hours each day and increase to 3 hours (50% of the day)

in grade 6. On September 6, 1990, amidst strong opposition from the DOE, the BOE approved the delay of English instruction to grade 5 (McMillen, 1991).

Expansion to the Secondary Level

In 1991, the O'ahu immersion parent group recommended to the BOE that the program be expanded from a K-6 program to a K-12 program and that the BOE establish at least one secondary site on each island (Board of Education, 1991a). DOE administrators were concerned about expansion because of a general lack of appropriate curriculum, certified and language proficient teachers in subject areas, and lack of facilities (Board of Education, 1991b). The parent group responded by presenting secondary curriculum that they and others had prepared (Kame'elehiwa, 1991). They also presented a list of over 100 students at the University of Hawai'i who were interested in becoming immersion teachers (Nā Leo Kāko'o O O'ahu, 1992). Kame'elehiwa, one of the parent lobbyists, suggested that the resistance on the part of the BOE and DOE to establish a secondary program stemmed from anti-Hawaiian sentiment.

> They didn't think we had enough material in Hawaiian to warrant going all the way through twelfth grade...they didn't think there was anything more you could teach after sixth grade in Hawaiian (Yamauchi, 1997c, paragraph 92)

At an October 1991, the DOE recommended to the BOE that (a) Kaiapuni grade 6 students receive English language instruction for two hours each day; (b) the Kaiapuni program be expanded to grades 7 and 8, in which 50% of instruction be conducted in English and 50% of instruction in Hawaiian; and (c) program evaluation assist the DOE in making future modifications to the program (Board of Education, 1991b). Although the DOE continued to submit testimony expressing their concern about expansion of the program to the secondary level and their desire to increase English language instruction (e.g.,

Garson, 1992; Kawamoto, 1992; Saiki, 1992), in September, 1992, the BOE again sided with the parents and approved a plan to expand the program through grade 12, with one hour of English instruction each day from grades 5-12 (McMillen, 1994).

Kaiapuni Today

Papahana Kaiapuni is an example of one native community's efforts to revitalize their language through total immersion education. It was designed to offer a quality education with a foundation in the Hawaiian language and culture (Department of Education, 1994). In addition to viewing Kaiapuni as an effort to revitalize a native language, many who were involved in the program's early development recognized its potential impact on promoting the education of Hawaiian youth, who as a group are often considered academically at-risk. As the principal of one of the Kaiapuni schools suggested,

> What sort of caused me to give it serious consideration was the knowledge that a lot of our Hawaiian, part-Hawaiian children were also our...at-risk or alienated children. And I thought that this if anything, had a tremendous amount of promise and potential. And quite possibly, some of these children...who are having a great deal of difficulty in school, might at least have a stronger sense of identity of cultural values...and Hawaiian self-worth."(Yamauchi, 1997b, paragraph 44).

Successful program outcomes. In the year 2000, the first students to have entered the Kaiapuni program will be graduating from high school. This in itself is a great triumph for the founders of the program, as one of the early teachers commented

> Just the fact that we've been around so long to me is a great achievement. When they first started, it was supposed to be a pilot K-2 program or something. And they figured, you know, after a while they'll stop being

> so enthusiastic or whatever, but it hasn't gone away....Just the fact that we're still around I think..is something. And the fact that people still want to put their kids in is...another testament (Yamauchi, 1997d).

Other successful outcomes include the academic achievement of Kaiapuni students. Slaughter's (1993) evaluation of the program indicated that Kaiapuni students were fluent speakers of English, even before they had formal instruction in the majority language. In addition, Kaiapuni students had very positive attitudes about themselves as readers and writers. These results suggest that the program is succeeding in its goals to produce students who are competent in two languages.

Those involved in the program also cite the positive effects on students' self-esteem and identity as Hawaiians.

> I think they're more proud to be Hawaiian...I think when I was growing up, or even when immersion first started,...you had that feeling that it's kind of shame to be Hawaiian or speak Hawaiian out in public...and if you did speak it was more like a cutesie, cutesie kind of a thing....there wasn't that much pride in it (Yamauchi, 1997f, paragraph 153).

A Kaiapuni principal also noted such a difference, "I don't think a child who goes through that program will ever question their roots. Who they are, they're cultural identity. I think that will be intact and that's significantly different from many Hawaiians who have gone before." (Yamauchi, 1997b, paragraph 186)

Current challenges and concerns. The program continues to face many of the same problems that were significant to the program's beginnings. As the program continues to develop, so does the need for more curriculum materials, especially for the secondary classrooms. Although there are more resources available now then when the program started, Kaiapuni teachers are still relying on teacher made materials that are very labor intensive. Some Kaiapuni teachers

are also struggling with how to integrate a "Western" curriculum with a more "Hawaiian" approach to teaching. These teachers mention a need to balance a focus on developing a curriculum that is relevant to students' lives in a modern Western society with a focus on developing a strong foundation in Hawaiian culture and values.

The program also continues to demand a constant source of qualified teachers who are proficient in the Hawaiian language. Kaiapuni teachers and parents also often find themselves lobbying the legislature and BOE each year for continued funding and other allocations of facilities and resources (Yamauchi, 1997e). In addition, many in the general public still hold misconceptions about what Kaiapuni is about and what it has accomplished (Yamauchi, 1997d). Amidst such challenges, however, those involved in Papahana Kaiapuni continue their commitment to its founders' vision of a Hawaii where ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i (the Hawaiian language) is spoken again.

References

Ah Nee-Benham, M. K., & Heck, R. H. (1997). *Culture and educational policy in Hawai'i: The silencing of native voices.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Aiona, D. (1989). *Update on the DOE Hawaiian Education Efforts.* Memorandum to Herman M. Aizawa, Assistant Superintendent, January 23, 1989.

Aiona, D. (1990). *Hawaiian language immersion program.* Memorandum to F. McMillen, August 30, 1990.

Aizawa, H. M. (1989). *Study group recommendations for the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program.* Memorandum to C. T. Toguchi, 1/24/89.

Board of Education (1987a). *Minutes of the Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee,* May 8. Honolulu, HI: Author.

Board of Education (1987b). *Legislative report.* Honolulu, HI: Author.

Board of Education (1987c). *Minutes of the Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee,* July 16, 1997.

Board of Education (1991a). *Minutes of the Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee,* August 28, 1991.

Board of Education (1991b). *Minutes of the Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee,* October 30, 1991.

Bowman, S. (1990, January/February). Pūnana Leo the quest to save the Hawaiian language. *Aloha,* 38-41.

Department of Education (1994, May). *Long-range plan for the Hawaiian language immersion program Papahana Kaiapuni Hawai'i (RS 94-555).* Honolulu, Hawai'i: Office of Instructional Services/General Education Branch.

Dunford, B. (1991, December). Language and heritage: A controversial language immersion program in Hawai'i is preserving the native culture. *Executive Education,* 38-39.

Garson, A. L. (1992). *Hawaiian language immersion program K-12.* Letter to F. McMillen, Chair of the BOE Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee, February 26, 1992.

Hammond, O. W., & Onikama, D L (1996). *Language use at home and school: A synthesis of research for Pacific educators.* Pacific Region Educational Laboratory, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kamanā, K., & Wilson, W. H. (1996). Hawaiian language programs. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 153-156). Flagstaff, AZ: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University.

Kame'elehiwa, L. K. (1991). *Hawaiian literature classes grade grades 7-12. Draft of a proposed curriculum for Kaiapuni secondary classes,* October 23, 1991.

Kame'eleihiwa, L. (1992). Kula Kaiapuni: Hawaiian immersion schools. *The Kamehameha Journal of Education, 3,* 109-118.

Kawamoto, R. (1992). *Comments on the long range plans for the Hawaiian language immersion program.* Memorandum to F. McMillen, Chair of the BOE Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee, February 26, 1992.

Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Krauss, M. (1996). Status of Native American language endangerment. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 16 - 21). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Kuykendall, R. S. (1926). *A history of Hawai'i.* New York: MacMillan.

McMillen, F. (1991). *Hawaiian language immersion program: English instruction for sixth grade students; Extension to grades 7 & 8.* Memorandum to C. T. Toguchi, Superintendent, October 30, 1991.

McMillen, F. (1994). *Hawaiian language immersion program.* Memorandum to D. Hartman, Chair of the BOE, March 10, 1994.

Melahn, C. L. (1986). *An application of an ecological perspective to the study of educational achievement among Native American Hawaiians.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i.

Met, M. (1987). Twenty questions :The most commonly asked questions about starting an immersion program. *Foreign Language Annals, 20,* 311 - 315.

Nā Leo Kāko'o O O'ahu (1992). *Proposal highlights for Kula Kaiapuni (immersion program) on O'ahu.* Proposal to the members of the BOE, February 6, 1992.

Office of Hawaiian Affairs (1994). *The Native Hawaiian data book.* Honolulu, HI: Author.

Reedy, T. M (1982, December). *Fostering the growth of indigenous languages.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Indigenous Peoples International Conference, Honolulu, HI.

Reyhner, J. (1996). Rationale and needs for stabilizing indigenous languages. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 3 -15). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Reyhner, J. & Tennant, E. (1995). Maintaining and Renewing Native Languages. *Bilingual Research Journal, 19,* 279 - 304.

Saiki, D. W. (1992). *Hawaiian language immersion program K-12,* Letter to F. McMillen, Chair of the BOE Hawaiian Education Affairs Committee, February 27, 1992.

Slaughter, H. (1993). Learning to read English outside the school: Patterns of first language literacy acquisition of Hawaiian language immersion students. *Educational Perspectives: Journal of the College of Education University of Hawai'i Mānoa, 28,* 9-17.

Slaughter, H. (1997). Indigenous Language Immersion In Hawai'i: A case study of Kula Kaiapuni Hawai'i, and effort to save the indigenous language of Hawai'i. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain, (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 105-129). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

St. Clair, R. N. (1982). What is language renewal? In R. St. Clair & W. Leap (Eds.), *Language renewal among American Indian tribes* (pp. 3 - 17). Rossylyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for bilingual Education.

Takenaka, C. (1995). *A perspective on Hawaiians.* A report to the Hawai'i Community Foundation. Honolulu, HI: Hawai'i Community Foundation.

Viotti, V. (1996, December 8). Native tongue. *The Honolulu Advertiser,* F-1, F14.

Vygotsky, L., & Luria, A. (1994). Tool and symbol in child development. In R. Can der Veer, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *The Vygotsky reader* (pp. 99 - 174). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Warner S. L. (1990). *The delay of the introduction of English in the Hawaiian language immersion program until grade five. Preliminary report to Dr. Herman Aizawa and the BOE Hawaiian Affairs Committee.* August 8, 1990.

Wilson, W. H. (in press). I ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i ke ola, 'Life is found in the Hawaiian language' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 132.*

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997a). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-10]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997b). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-9]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997c). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-2]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997d). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-1]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997e). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-3]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997f). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-4]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997g). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-8]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997h). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-7]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A. (1997i). [Transcript of Historical Interview #97-6]. Unpublished raw data.

Yamauchi, L. A., & Ceppi, A. K. (in press). A review of indigenous language immersion programs and a focus on Hawai'i. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 31*

Appendix A

Interview Questions

1. Would you state your name and spell it for us?
2. If you don't mind, would you tell us your age?
3. What is your ethnicity? (If multiple, is there one that you particularly identify with?)
4. Where did you grow up?
5. Do you speak Hawaiian?
    a. If yes, when and how did you learn the language? And from whom?
    b. In what contexts do you use the language?
6. You were named as someone who would have a unique perspective on the development of the Hawaiian Immersion program. Could you describe your role in the program's development?
7. Are you still involved in the program? In what capacity?
8. What were your goals or reasons for getting involved in the program?
    a. In what ways are the program goals similar to or different from your own goals for the program? (Show list of program goals.)
9. What have you learned about the program since you have been (or were) involved in it?
    a. How, if at all, have your feelings about the program changed over this time?
10. We are interested in documenting the history of the program. What do you think led to the creation and development of the program?
11. Who are some of the people that you think were instrumental in getting the program started and developing it to where it is today?
12. What do you think are the most successful program outcomes so far? In other words, what has the program been able to do best?

13. What do you see as the most difficult challenges of the program?
    a. How do you think the program can move to overcome these challenges?
14. From your perspective where and when in the curriculum do you think the English language should be introduced and used? Why?
15. In what ways, if any, do you think the program influences students and their families when they are outside of the school setting?
16. In what ways, if at all, do you think the program influences how Hawaiian students in the program think about themselves as Hawaiians?
17. In what ways, if at all, do think the program is important for people who are not of Hawaiian ancestry?
18. In what ways, if at all, do you think the program is important for people who are not Hawaiian speakers?
19. How supportive do you think the general public is of the program?
20. What advice do you have for other Native American communities who are considering developing an indigenous immersion program?
21. What are important points for such communities to consider in making a decision to start an immersion program?
22. Are there any other comments that you would like to make regarding your perspective on the program's history and development?
23. Are there other people that you recommend that we talk to about these issues?